

**REMARKS**

As an initial matter, Applicant thanks Examiner for the acknowledgment that Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although Applicant tends to disagree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, and 8 to better clarify the invention. Applicant's amendments are being made pursuant to a telephone interview with the Examiner in which the Examiner admitted that such amendments overcome the cited references in the 03/13/06 Office Action.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration.

**I. CLAIMS 1-6, 8-10 ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE CITED REFERENCES**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness. In regard to the claims, as amended, the Examiner cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, four basic criteria must be met. First, a prior art reference must be analogous art. Second, from the prior analogous art, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify or combine reference teachings. Third, there must be a reasonable expectation of success in modifying or combining reference teachings. Finally, the combined prior art references must teach or suggest all claim features. See MPEP § 706.02(j). See *King Instrument Corp. v. Otari Corp.*, 767 F.2d 853 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

**1. The references do not disclose all claim features**

**A. Nakamura et al., even when combined with Dewdney or Osmani, does not teach or suggest a joint portion pivotally connecting said plate-like portions with each other, said joint portion being free from contact with said sliding sections, as required by claims 1-6 and 8-10**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 8-10 for obviousness over Nakamura et al. in view of Dewdney. Applicant respectfully asserts that with regard to the claims, as amended, the Examiner cannot meet the requirement that all claim features be taught or suggested in the cited references.

Claims 1 and 8, as amended, require that said body section further include at least one joint portion pivotally connecting said plate-like portions with each other, said joint portion being free from contact with said sliding sections. Pursuant to a telephone interview with the Examiner, it has been shown that the cited references do not teach or suggest said body section further including at least one joint portion pivotally connecting said plate-like portions with each other, said joint portion being free from contact with said sliding sections.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge all fees due and any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 13-3723.

Respectfully submitted,

8/14/06  
Date

By: David J. Shenk  
David J. Shenk, Reg. No.: 58,025  
Telephone No.: 512-984-4669

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833